



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

In 343D, ἀφελεῖν ὡς ἐπίφθονον τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα does not, I think, mean "get rid of this word government," but "do away with the invidious designation of my rule as despotism" (δεσπότης *supra*). In 354D, ἐπὶ τῆς μεσιτείας is not, I think, "the middle of the road," but the unpopular business of judicial arbitration, of which Julian is speaking. He, perhaps, picked up this word too from the Platonic epistles. In 371B, εἰς ἀχάριστα καταθέμενος ἦθη τὰς χάριτας is not "I transformed your graciousness to ungracious ways," but "I bestowed my kindness on ungrateful minds." Cf. Catullus lxxvi. 9, *omnia quae ingratae perierunt credita menti*; Isoc. i. 29 and the phrase σπείρων εἰς ἀχάριστα.

Of the some half-dozen plausible emendations proposed by Mrs. Wright κουνὸν for καινὸν in 240B seems to me certain.

PAUL SHOREY

*Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin.* By F. W. WEST-  
AWAY. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.

"This book," according to its Preface, "is not for schoolmasters. It is intended principally for (1) private students who desire to learn to pronounce and to read Latin correctly; and (2) those who feel that their acquired pronunciation needs overhauling." This purpose is legitimate and commendable; yet for the most part the author cannot be said to have achieved success in his treatment. The book suffers from defective knowledge on the part of the writer, as well as from looseness of statement. Thus on p. 16, we are told that "after *n* the *u* in *gu* is generally consonantal." A precise statement would omit the word "generally" and tell *when* the *u* in *gu* is consonantal, viz., when it is followed by a vowel. Similarly on p. 18: "In Latin, *u* before another vowel is generally consonantal." This statement is positively erroneous. Except when the *u* before another vowel is preceded by *ng*, and in *suavis*, *suesco*, *suadeo*, with their compounds and derivatives, *u* before a vowel is generally a vowel. Witness the host of words like *tuus*, *suus*, *annuus*, *annuo*, *arduus*, *perpetuus*, *exiguus*, *arguo*, *sus*, *suis*, *fui*, *fuera*m, etc. Equally inaccurate is the statement on p. 21: "The *u* in *su* is generally a consonant." On p. 5, we are told that "there is a difference of opinion about short *o* . . . but the weight of opinion is in favour of the sound of *o* in *not*." Yet on p. 8, the author gives the sounds of French *robe* and German *Sonne* as illustrating the sound in question! Similarly on p. 11, "Latin *ae* may be pronounced as in *Isaiah*, when pronounced broadly. It is nearly like German *ä*. French *travail* gives the sound fairly accurately." Now apart from the utter vagueness of the designation "broad sound," what possible similarity can one detect between German *ä* and the second syllable of French *travail*?

The most refreshing parts of the book are those treating of the division of words into syllables and those devoted to the reading of Latin verse. The discussion of the former topic begins at p. 32, and rejects the traditional division *magi-ster* in favor of *magis-ter*; and yet the author seems to have failed to grasp the significance of the results of Dennison's paper cited at the bottom of p. 34.

On p. 35, one reads: "correct pronunciation of Latin depends very largely upon an accurate knowledge of syllable length. The length of the syllable and the length of the contained vowel are two totally different things, and must not be confused." This gladdens the heart; and yet the author himself does confuse these very things, for on p. 34, he says: "a final short vowel is rarely lengthened before two consonants." He means syllable here, not vowel, and the persons for whom the book is intended are likely to be seriously confused by these contradictions.

I have already indicated my approval of the author's views on the subject of the reading of Latin poetry. Thus on p. 89, he urges that it is not accent rhythm, but quantity rhythm, as determined by syllable length, that is important in poetry; on p. 88, he protests against the traditional practice of making Latin poetry a stress rhythm by placing unnatural word-accent on the syllables, adding on p. 89, "if accurate syllable length is maintained and accent is always made as light as possible, the correct reading of Latin poetry ought to cause little difficulty." Having borne the burden and heat of the day in preaching and defending these principles, I naturally take much satisfaction in reading the portion of Mr. Westaway's work dealing with this topic, even though in the somewhat full bibliography at the end of the volume no mention is made either of my own writings on the reading of Latin verse, or those of Kauciniski, Kobilinski, Gerhard Schultz, and others.

I close with a list of false quantities which I have noted in the course of my examination of this book: p. 46, *lāc*, 28, *māior*, *āio*; p. 49, *Pompēius*, *plebēius*; p. 53, "the vowel is usually long before *gn*"; 53, *frōndis*; p. 56, *disto*; p. 57, *pūlmo*; p. 57, *ālsi*, *fūlsi*, *mūlsi*, *indūlsi*, *ūltimus*, *ūltra*; p. 90, *āc*. On p. 52, we are informed that when a *g* becomes *c* before *s* or *t*, the preceding vowel is lengthened, and are besides assured that this lengthening is in accord with the ordinary principles of phonetics. This would give us *remēx*, *remīgis*; *aquilēx*, *aquilēgis*; *grēx*, *grēgis*, not to mention other monstrosities. If Mr. Westaway is correct in the quantities enumerated in this paragraph, then the men who for a quarter of a century have been our recognized leaders and authorities in historical Latin grammar are wrong. The odd thing is that the author expressly disclaims having made any researches in this field, but professes only to present the results of others.

CHARLES E. BENNETT